



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds. By FRANK AYDELOTTE, B.Litt. [Oxford Historical and Literary Studies, issued under the Direction of C. H. Firth and Walter Raleigh, Professors of Modern History and English Literature in the University of Oxford, vol. I.] (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1913. Pp. xii, 187.)

THIS monograph by a former Rhodes scholar shows an intimate understanding of an Oxford way of thinking. Its author has caught that tradition which associates history with literature and interprets each by the aid of the other.

Mr. Aydelotte discusses the origins of sixteenth-century vagabondage, describes the art of begging and classifies the members of that profession, analyzes the several acts against vagrancy and points out their effects, treats not unsympathetically the art of conny-catching, goes over the statutes passed against the conny-catcher, and lastly attempts a survey of the noteworthy rogue pamphlets. The survey is limited. He discusses the *Manifest Detection*, Awdeley's *Fraternity of Vacabondes*, Harman's *Caveat for Common Cursetors*, Robert Greene's several discoveries of conny-catching, and six or seven other less notable pamphlets that followed in their wake. From this literature of roguery and from a great variety of historical sources—it is hard to think of anything essential that he has overlooked—as well as from a wide range of dramatists he has put together the first description at all complete of Elizabethan roguery. His main thesis, that the Elizabethan rogue pamphlets were not a revamping of Continental lore, but were real pictures of terrible social conditions in England, he proves up to the hilt. The suggestion is not new. It was offered a good while ago by such editors as Grosart, though Chandler's recent *Literature of Roguery* has perhaps tended to obscure it. Mr. Aydelotte has not only made historical the existence of a well-organized and stratified rogue society, he has shown more clearly than before the beneficial effects of the Elizabethan legislation against vagrancy, and he has turned a new side-light on that bureau of efficiency, the Tudor Privy Council. Two criticisms may be ventured. He has overemphasized the increase of vagrancy under the Tudors, and he should have told us something about the passage of the statutes against vagabondage. The facts, for example, as to the progress through Parliament of the statute of 1572 and as to the personnel involved are matters neither hard to get at nor uninteresting.

In regard to literary origins and relationships Mr. Aydelotte has done something new, in spite of the fact that Grosart, Furnivall, Halliwell-Phillips, and Viles—not to mention Chandler—have threshed the straw pretty thoroughly. Very neatly he has proved that Samuel Rid rather than Samuel Rowlands was the author of *Martin Mark-all*, *Beadle of Bridewell*. He has made a new suggestion as to Dekker's part in *Lanthorne and Cendlelight*. He has dug out of Greene's *Second Part*

of *Conny-Catching* a possible clue to the authorship of the *Defense of Conny-Catching*. Why he ignores Grosart's suggestion (Greene, *Works*, I. 131), which seems to fit in well with his own, it is hard for an outsider to see. One may ask too, why has Ben Jonson's *Alchemist* been so nearly ignored, or for that matter his *Bartholomew Fair*. Is not Doll a "shee-conny-catcher", Subtle a "hee-conny-catcher", and Face a "verser"? And has not Hathaway in his critical edition of the *Alchemist* given just that historical background to the conny-catchers in alchemy, which Mr. Aydelotte is giving to others? A further question, hesitantly. May not Reginald Scot have owed something of his impulsion to Harman? He must have known the *Caveat*. He went at things in a way not unlike.

Mr. Aydelotte has written an excellent monograph. He has made brilliant use of his materials. He has done more: he has caught the deeper significances of his subject. Moreover he handles with ease and lightness what may be called the English of Oxford.

WALLACE NOTESTEIN.

The House of Lords in the Reign of William III. By A. S. TURBERVILLE. [Oxford Historical and Literary Studies, issued under the Direction of C. H. Firth and Walter Raleigh, Professors of Modern History and English Literature in the University of Oxford, vol. III.] (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1913. Pp. vi, 264.)

THE structure and the development of English government have been the subject of an immense literature, but relatively some parts of the subject have been neglected. Anglo-Saxon organization, the beginnings of English law, the rise of Parliament, and the history of the House of Commons have been dealt with specially and at length. On the other hand the history of the executive and of the departments in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has been scantily dealt with, and comparatively little has been written about the House of Lords. Since the *Reports on the Dignity of a Peer*, published 1820-1829, the number of authoritative works includes scarcely more than Pike's *Constitutional History of the House of Lords* (1894) and Professor Firth's *House of Lords during the Civil War* (1910). An exhaustive account of some part of the subject, therefore, may be cordially welcomed.

The author's study is made at first hand from the sources. The basis must necessarily be the official records of the house supplemented by the scanty debates yielded by various *Collections* or which patient research discovers at wide random. In this particular period, however, the author is able to supplement the *Lords Journals* with the ampler and far more interesting "Minutes", which as *Manuscripts of the House of Lords* have been published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission down to 1693, and independently through the year 1702. It is this